

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KELLY FARRINGTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARTIN O'MALLEY,  
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,<sup>1</sup>

Defendant.

Case No. 1:23-cv-01374-HBK<sup>2</sup>

ORDER GRANTING AWARD AND  
PAYMENT OF ATTORNEYS FEES UNDER  
THE EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

(Doc. No. 21)

Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated motion for award of attorney's fees filed on August 15, 2024. (Doc. No. 21). The parties agree to an award of attorney's fees and expenses to Plaintiff's attorney, Jonathan O. Peña of Peña & Bromberg, PLC, in the amount of \$6,000.00 in attorney fees and expenses, pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"), 28 U.S.C. § 2412. (*Id.*).

On May 17, 2024, this Court granted the parties' stipulated motion for a remand and remanded the case pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to the Commissioner for

---

<sup>1</sup> Martin O'Malley, who became the Commissioner of Social Security on December 20, 2023, is substituted as the proper Defendant pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d).

<sup>2</sup> Both parties have consented to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §636(c)(1). (Doc. No. 10).

1 further administrative proceedings. (Doc. No. 19). Judgment was entered the same day. (Doc.  
2 No. 20). Plaintiff now requests an award of fees as the prevailing party. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2412(a)  
3 & (d)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(1); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1920; *cf. Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S.  
4 292, 300-02 (1993) (concluding that a party who wins a sentence-four remand order under 42  
5 U.S.C. § 405(g) is a prevailing party). The Commissioner does not oppose the requested relief.

6 The EAJA provides for an award of attorney fees to private litigants who both prevail in  
7 civil actions (other than tort) against the United States and timely file a petition for fees. 28  
8 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(A). Under the Act, a court shall award attorney fees to the prevailing party  
9 unless it finds the government's position was "substantially justified or that special circumstances  
10 make such an award unjust." *Id.* Here, the government did not show its position was  
11 substantially justified and the Court finds no special circumstances to make an award unjust.

12 Based on the stipulation, the Court finds an award of \$6,000.00 in attorney fees and  
13 expenses is appropriate. EAJA fees, expenses, and costs are subject to any offsets allowed under  
14 the Treasury Offset Program ("TOP"), as discussed in *Astrue v. Ratliff*, 532 U.S. 1192 (2010). If  
15 the Commissioner determines upon effectuation of this Order that Plaintiff's EAJA fees are not  
16 subject to any offset allowed under the TOP, the fees shall be delivered or otherwise transmitted  
17 to Plaintiff's counsel.

18 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

19 1. The stipulated motion for attorney fees and expenses (Doc. No. 21) is **GRANTED**.  
20 2. The Commissioner is directed to pay to Plaintiff as the prevailing party EAJA fees in  
21 the amount of \$6,000.00 in attorney fees and expenses. Unless the Department of Treasury  
22 determines that Plaintiff owes a federal debt, the government shall make payment of the EAJA  
23 fees to Plaintiff's counsel, Jonathan O. Peña of Peña & Bromberg, PLC, in accordance with  
24 Plaintiff's assignment of fees and subject to the terms of the stipulated motion.

25 Dated: August 19, 2024

  
HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE